

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in view of the above-referenced Office Action, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

Request for Interview

Applicant respectfully requests the courtesy of an interview via telephone to resolve any outstanding concerns of the Examiner and expedite prosecution of this application. In preparing the present response, the undersigned was unable to understand what interpretation might be given to Blatter in order for the claims to be read on Blatter. If the undersigned has misunderstood the Office's interpretation of claim terminology or Blatter, the courtesy of an interview is solicited in order to properly respond to the present rejections. The undersigned can be reached at the telephone number on the last page of this response.

Amendments

Several minor amendments have been made to correct typographical or other minor errors in the specification and claims. In several instances, it was noted that the term "program identifier" was erroneously used in place of the correct term "packet identifier" to mean "PID", and these incorrect usages have been corrected. Such amendment clearly involves no new matter and the intended meaning was clearly already understood by the Examiner. The error in the paragraph spanning pages 3 and 4 renders the text consistent with Figure 2.

Background

The undersigned wishes to bring to the Examiner's attention the fact that the claims use the term "shadow PID" which is explained in part in the paragraph spanning pages 3 and 4, which in part states:

"... multiple sets of encrypted packets representing the encrypted portions of the partially encrypted programs are distinguished from one another by use of distinctive packet identifiers (PIDs). Thus, for example, two encrypted portions of a program have two unique PIDs - a primary PID and a shadow (or secondary) PID. In order for the receiving equipment to

Application No.: 10/084,106

determine which PIDs are associated with a particular encryption scheme the PID information is transmitted from the cable system (or other distributor) headend.”

In the present application, to briefly describe without intent of imposing additional limitations, portions of the same program (generally duplicate content encrypted under multiple encryption systems – see first two full paragraphs of page 3) are communicated using multiple PID values – a primary PID and a shadow PID. In order to convey the PID values over the network, a PAT is constructed that conveys the primary PID. A PMT is constructed for each program. The primary PID is then related to a shadow PID for the program in a lookup table so that a receiver requiring the shadow PID can find out what shadow PID is associated with the program.

Regarding the Rejections

The Blatter reference of record is asserted to anticipate all claims. However, after a thorough review of Blatter this assertion is believed to be incorrect for at least the following reasons:

Blatter discloses essentially that the PSI data can be compacted to facilitate reduced overhead (col. 1, lines 65-67) using what Blatter refers to as “condensed PSI” or “CPSI”. At col. 2, lines 38-48, Blatter states (paraphrased) that a plurality of PIDs are used to identify a plurality of data streams representing a plurality programs. At col. 8, lines 16-29, the process used to create the CPSI is described. In essence, a base PID is defined to identify a PMT, and predefined offsets are added to the base PID value to determine PID values for video, audio, caption, PCR, and NIT as illustrated by example in Table 1. Moreover, Blatter uses the same set of PID values to represent multiple programs (col. 8, lines 30-37). Additionally, Blatter’s CPSI is formed from the full PSI captured from the transport data stream received as a system input (col. 8, lines 8-15).

CLAIM 1

With reference to Independent claim 1, Blatter fails to anticipate this claim which calls for “constructing a lookup table that maps at least one primary PID to at least one shadow PID”.

Application No.: 10/084,106

Blatter first of all appears to fail to disclose anything that can be properly read to be a shadow PID as defined by Applicant. Secondly, Blatter clearly fails to construct a "lookup table" that maps at least one primary PID to one shadow PID as called out in the claim, and finally Blatter fails to transmit such lookup table along with a PMT and PAT over a content delivery medium as called for by the claim.

By contrast to applicant, Blatter apparently has nothing that meets the requirements of being a shadow PID, and to the extent one PID of any type is related to another PID, that relationship is fixed by a predefined offset. Once an offset is defined, transmission of a lookup table that relates one PID to another would conflict with Blatter's objective to reduce the overhead of the PSI. If an offset is used, one merely needs to know the base PID and the offset in order to relate one PID to another. Hence, any lookup table as claimed which relates one PID to another PID would produce unnecessary overhead in direct conflict with Blatter's objectives. Clearly there can be no anticipation. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 2-3

These claims depend from claim 1, and are hence allowable at least for the reasons noted in connection with claim 1.

Specifically regarding claim 2, although the Office points to various discussions relating to user private data by Blatter, none meet the requirement of transmitting the claimed lookup table using user private data. In particular, col. 10, lines 25-33 discuss: